

REMARKS

Claims 1-40 are pending in the present application, with claims 1, 11, 14, 24, 27 and 37 being the independent claims. Claims 1, 11, 14, 24, 27, and 37 are amended. No new matter has been added.

In the Final Rejection dated June 6, 2007, claims 1-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,822,435 issued to Boebert et al. Applicants filed a complete response on August 3, 2007. In an Advisory Action dated August 14, 2007, the Examiner indicated that rejections of June 6, 2007 were not overcome and the application is not yet in condition for allowance. The outstanding rejections to the claims are respectfully traversed. Reconsideration is requested. Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are in condition for allowance.

Applicants gratefully acknowledge that the Examiner has indicated that the drawings are accepted.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102

In the Final Rejection, claims 1-40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,822,435 issued to Boebert et al. (hereinafter referred to as “Boebert”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 1, 14 and 27 have been amended to further clarify the claimed subject matter, and to address the Examiner’s assertion in the Advisory Action that the claims do not recite detecting the intended execution environment without requiring separate steps. Independent claims 1 and 14, as amended, recite “determining, based on said user input and not on execution environment selection input, whether said user input is intended for said secured execution environment”. This feature is neither disclosed nor anticipated by the prior art. Page 4 of the Final Rejection asserts that Boebert column 9, lines 53-65, column 5, line 27, and column 6, lines 26-29 disclose determining, based on said user input, whether said user input is intended for said secured execution environment. Applicants respectfully disagree. In Boebert, the determination on whether the secured path mode is used is performed manually as an additional step by the user to select the execution environment. Boebert recites:

Trusted path mode can be invoked in a number of ways. In one embodiment, a switch on trusted path subsystem 30 can be used to manually activate trusted path mode. A second method would be to invoke trusted path mode by a combination of keys pressed simultaneously on keyboard 20 (like the control/alt/delete key sequence on a PC-compatible computer). A third embodiment would require that the user insert some sort of token device into subsystem 30. A token device might range from a smart card to a cryptoignition key. In the preferred embodiment, subsystem 30 would also have a feedback mechanism such as a light to notify the user that subsystem 30 was in trusted path mode. (*Boebert, column 5, lines 66-77 column 6, lines 1-10*)

As can be seen from this excerpt, Boebert requires manual intervention to select the execution environment, for example, to select “trusted path mode”. Such manual intervention is provided through additional user input or activities, distinct from entering user data intended for execution. The examples provided by Boebert demonstrate Boebert’s intention of disclosing activities that require separate, overt, and intentional acts to select an execution environment, or “trusted path mode”. As seen in the excerpt above, these examples include selecting a specific combination of keys on the keyboard, inserting a token device into the trusted path subsystem, and manually activating a switch in the trusted path subsystem. These are all additional, manual steps that the user must perform to choose a specific execution environment beyond entering user data intended for an execution environment.

Boebert does not use user input intended for an execution environment to determine whether trusted path mode should be used. In contradistinction to claims 1 and 14, as can be seen from the excerpt above, Boebert requires a separate action, or step, on behalf of the user solely for the purpose of dictating to Boebert’s system whether the trusted path mode should be used. Claims 1 and 14 disclose “determining, based on said user input and not on execution environment selection input, whether said user input is intended for said secured execution environment”. Claims 1 and 14 do not require separate user steps apart from the entering of user data to determine whether the user input is intended for a secured execution environment, as taught in Boebert. The Office Action appears to be equating Boebert’s required additional, manual user actions for selecting trusted path mode with the user input of

the claimed subject matter. The user input of claims 1 and 14 is not the manual user activity required of Boebert. Therefore, Boebert does not disclose or anticipate “determining, **based on said user input and not on execution environment selection input**, whether said user input is intended for said secured execution environment”.

Applicants respectfully submit that Boebert does not disclose or anticipate all the elements of claims 1 and 14 or claims depending therefrom, including claims 2-10 and 15 - 23. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the §102(b) rejection of claims 1-10 and 14-23.

Claim 27 is rejected on substantially the same grounds as claims 1 and 14. Therefore, the arguments set forth above also apply to claim 27. Applicants respectfully submit that Boebert does not disclose or anticipate all the elements of claim 27 as amended, or claims depending therefrom, including claims 28-36. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the §102(b) rejection of claims 27-36.

Claims 11, 24, and 37 have been amended to further clarify the claimed subject matter. Independent claims 11 and 24, as amended, recite “accepting output from a specific source entity within said secured execution environment and not within said second execution environment”. This feature is neither disclosed or anticipated in the prior art. The Final Rejection, on page 6, alleges that Boebert column 8, lines 45-50 and 57-63, and column 9 lines 53-65 discloses accepting output from a specific source entity in said secured execution environment and securely transferring said output to an output device. The Final Rejection asserts that in Boebert’s secure mode, an output is transferred and stored in a video RAM, which is not used in normal mode, and output and displayed on a trusted window is teaching securely transferring said output to an output device as claimed in claims 11 and 24. Applicants respectfully disagree.

In Boebert, the output originates on a device that is security neutral in that it is neither secured nor unsecured in itself. The output of the device is manipulated based on the mode, which determines the security of the transfer of output. The device is entirely capable of sending unsecured output as well as secured output. This is readily apparent from the text of and figures of Boebert. As indicated in Boebert, column 8, lines 45-50 and Figure 5, video data is transmitted from video port 44. Data is accepted from this port regardless of mode:

Video data from workstation 40 is transmitted from video port 44 to video manager 34. During normal mode, the video data is sent through to display 10 without modification. During trusted path mode, however, the video data transferred from video port 44 is overlaid, at least in some part, by video data generated by video manager 34. (*Boebert, column 8, lines 45-50*)

If Boebert's system is in secured mode, the output is stored in an intermediary component, the video RAM. If it is not in secured mode, it is not diverted to the intermediary video RAM. (*Boebert, column 8, lines 57-63.*) This is a diversion of the output based on the security mode of the system, not accepting data from a separate, secured source. The source of the output data is the same, regardless of the mode. This is not the same as "accepting output from **a specific source entity within said secured execution environment and not within said second execution environment**; and securely transferring said output to an output device". Boebert's output source is the same source whether Boebert's system is functioning in trusted mode or not. The source is not a specific source entity within a secured execution environment. Therefore, Boebert does not disclose or anticipate accepting output from a specific source entity in said secured execution environment and securely transferring said output to an output device.

Applicants submit that Boebert does not disclose or anticipate all the elements of claims 11 and 24 or claims depending therefrom, including claims 12-13 and 25-26. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the §102(b) rejection of claims 11-13 and 24-26.

Claim 37 is rejected on substantially the same basis as claims 11 and 24. Therefore, the arguments set forth above in regards to claims 11 and 24 also apply to claim 37. Applicants respectfully submit that Boebert does not disclose or anticipate all the elements of claim 37 or claims depending therefrom, including claims 38-40. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the §102(b) rejection of claims 37-40.

Applicants acknowledge that the Office Action establishes additional grounds for rejection of the claims that are dependent upon claims 1, 11, 14, 24, 27 and 37. However, in view of the traversals set forth with respect to the independent claims, Applicants believe that all such dependent claims are in condition for allowance, rendering the rejections of those

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-2817
Application No.: 10/693,407
Office Action Dated: June 6, 2007

**PATENT
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO
37 CFR § 1.116**

claims moot. Applicants believe that this response completely and accurately addresses all grounds of rejection. Applicants reserve the right to challenge the rejection of any of those dependent claims in any future response that may be forthcoming.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that this application, including claims 1-40, is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 5, 2007

/ Aaron F. Bourgeois /
Aaron F. Bourgeois
Registration No. 57,936

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439